

RECEIVED FOR RECORD

VOLUME \_\_\_\_\_ PAGE \_\_\_\_\_

200 APR 13 P 1:27

TRUMBULL TOWN RECORDS

ATTEST  
TOWN CLERK

**PLANNING AND ZONING  
Special Meeting  
Wednesday, April 7, 2010**

A special meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Trumbull was held in the Long Hill Room on Wednesday, April 7, 2010.

Attendance: Gary Bean, Chairman  
Anthony Chory; Fred Garrity, Jr.; Arlyne Fox; Chris Costa; Alternate Steve Mahlstedt;  
Alternate Anthony Silber

Staff Present: Mario Coppola, Town Attorney; Bill Levin, Town Planner

The following is a brief summary of the meeting. The complete record is on tape, on file in the office of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

A quorum being present, the chairman called the meeting to order at 7:05pm.

Mr. Bean noted the discussion would be directed to the establishment of a commercial/Residential Mixed – Use Zone criteria. Meeting was turned over the Bill Levin for presentation of two proposals to the Commission. He noted he is presenting a slightly revised document after comments made by some commissioners. He divided the B-C Zone into two variances. He recommended a B-C which is the basis for a commercial zone but have some variance based on size of parcel.

The proposal suggests 2.5 acres as a cut off between the two zones. B-C-C is a business-community-commercial zone and a B-C-N which would be business-commercial-neighborhood. Differences in the B-C-N – does not allow a department store, automobile sales or hotels. Bed and Breakfast would be included in the residential areas. Mr. Levin noted usage could be changed.

Mr. Bean noted the current B-C zone was taken and these two additional zones were proposed by making modifications as to the lot size and what would be allowed in each zone. Both proposed zones apply to everything that we currently have with regard to usage. Mr. Levin noted the only changes were the noted restrictions. In both cases, private occupational schools were added such as driving school, dance academies, marshal arts, scuba training, etc. which already exist in our commercial zones. Only small specialized schools would be allowed. Discussion of specialized schools was held and their position in this type of zone.

Discussion of overlay zones was held.

Mr. Levin noted the additional of residential in the zone is a major change in philosophy that should be discussed. This would also allow more flexibility for setbacks, etc. but the division into the two zones does not require major changes, just fine tuning.

Mr. Garrity thought the commission was to discuss and get language for a mixed use zone, which would be new, and then modify it. He stated the commission went from having a zone that would have both uses to now it can be in every zone. Mr. Bean noted the purpose is to entertain adding mixed use to a business/commercial zone.

Mr. Levin clarified the proposals – the B-C-C zone is the current B-C zone and now we are talking about creating a new variant which is the B-C-N. It basically is one zone with a few differences which are arbitrary. The residential usage would be restricted to 40% of the total commercial acreage. It should also be limited to where it is located according to lot size.

Mr. Silber noted the initial concept was a floating zone and it was proposed to add mixed use. Discussions have progressed into applying mixed use to the existing B-C zones and we are now moving in the direction of further limitations. Mr. Bean noted the first proposal was a floating zone but the commission was uncomfortable to adding mixed use especially residential to those areas. Now we are proposing adding mixed use to existing B-C zones.

Mr. Capolla left the meeting at 7:30pm.

Lengthy discussion was held regarding various B-C zones in the town including Long Hill, Town Hall, etc. and how these proposals will work in the existing zones. Mr. Bean stated the commission needs to look out 10-20 years and ask what they want the area to look like at that time. We should not pass a regulation that applies to any one parcel, we want to encourage and promote the area to be redeveloped. It was noted that non-conforming areas might be reduced with these plans. Mrs. Fox asked about a buffer between the residential portion and the commercial portion.

Mr. Bean stated we should take a specific B-C zone and address within that area whether it is compatible and warrants the addition of residential use for the long term. Mr. Cappola had previously asked if rather than addressing a zone in that manner you would leave the zone as it is and you would have individual projects that you would address which would be floating zones in individual parcels. Discussion of spot zoning ensued. Long Hill Green area was discussed.

Mr. Garrity suggested that we use the two proposed documents and designate the area as a B-C zone. Applicants would state they wanted to use one of the proposals in the area. Discussion. He also noted the commission does not have a business plan whereby future investors can look at it and apply to develop a particular site. This should be presented to the public for review. Mr. Bean noted the residential part of the development is not required by the developer of the site. Determination of the Long Hill Green zone needs to be decided. Mr. Garrity noted that we are trying to allow commercial areas to have the ability to have residential applications.

Mr. Costa asked why we need to consider this. Mr. Silber stated that we have a vision of what we want our commercial areas to look like, including residential. This would be considered a pedestrian friendly zone. Mrs. Fox noted that she is not in favor of residential over business.

Mr. Levin stated Trumbull is unbalanced in having almost entirely single family house that are on large lots but there are large components of the population that do not want such responsibilities and would like to still live in this area and there are very limited opportunities in the town to provide alternative types of housing including multifamily. The commercial zone provides an alternative location. This also provides an environment whereby residents can walk to local businesses instead of driving and addresses the affordability factor.

Mr. Bean took a poll of the commission regarding their position on mixed-use zoning: Fox – against apartments over retail and mixed-use; Garrity – in favor; Costa – opposed; Chory – opposed; Silber – in favor; Mahlstedt – in favor, Bean – in favor. We are encouraging redevelopment, reinvestment, dealing with housing issues and going back to a neighborhood setting that does not require driving. This will channel economic development. Lengthy discussion about transition from residential to business was held.

Mr. Cappola returned to the meeting at 8:30pm and mentioned the affordability requirement which does benefit the town for future applications. Also, suggested that the town planner review other mixed-use zones in CT.

Mr. Bean stated the commission should pursue the proposal with input on set backs, etc., and move forward with this on the Long Hill Green. In the event we vote it in and Long Hill is rezoned to include this, the commission still has the opportunity on any given parcel requesting a special permit to accept or deny it on its appropriateness in that location. He asked that the commission continue on the path to look to adding mixed use to that one zone. This will require a public hearing and can be voted down by the commission at that point. Mr. Levin was requested to revise the proposal with the mixed-use component for the next meeting.

Mr. Cappola commented on the language for the title of the business district to keep within the appropriate statutes and regulations. It was suggested to use the name Long Hill Green Business District.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50pm by Mr. Bean.

Respectfully submitted,



Barbara Crandall  
Administrative Assistant